



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1470
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,307	11/12/2003	Shyam Kapur	017887-011400US	8867

29989 7590 04/04/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

LE, DEBBIE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2168

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/712,307	Applicant(s) KAPUR, SHYAM	
	Examiner DEBBIE M. LE	Art Unit 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/20/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The recited claims fail to recite a hardware to make it tangible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen et al (U.S patent Application publication no. 2003/0014399 A1).

As per claim 1, Hansen discloses a method for processing queries, the method comprising:

receiving a set of previous queries (i.e., processing a log file of user's activities submit queries to the search facility, or search sessions, collection of query groups), **wherein each of the previous queries includes one or more units** (i.e., each of search session consists of user's search terms, i.e., search terms can be grouped through clustering or grouping) (parg. 0039);

sorting the queries into subsets (as query groups based on patterns of access recorded by search sessions, i.e., topic sessions) **along a dimension** (as wherein search section also include a timestamp) (parg. 0040);

generating one or more subset-specific concept networks for each subset of the queries (as IP address associated with a proxy user, or a timestamp associated with the logged event, a URL associated with a target Web page, and then groups of queries are formed based on the similarity of their associated search sessions) (parg. 0052, 0065); and

comparing corresponding subset-specific concept networks from at least two of the subsets (as identifying the group(s) with the user's search term in the given a new queries), **thereby generating trend information for a unit** (as the most strongly identified groups return a list of indices to the most relevant records in the database, by the query group, this query groups and relevance weights are used to aid users with future searches (parg. 0040, last 5 lines, parg. 0108-0109).

As per claim 2, Hansen teaches wherein the dimension is a time dimension (timestamp, parg. 0052).

As per claim 3, Hansen teaches wherein the dimension is defined by reference to one or more demographic characteristics of users (as common interests or habits of users, a URL address associated with a target Web page, a user's search session consists of their search terms and URLs of all HTML pages they visited in response to their query) (parg. 0046, 0110).

As per claim 4, Hansen teaches wherein the dimension is a geographic dimension (as IP address associated with a proxy ser) (parg. 0052).

As per claim 5, Hansen teaches wherein the dimension is a vertical dimension representing a user context of the query (Fig. 1, parg. 0050).

Claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 arguments.

Claims 12-15 have similar limitations as claims 2-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-10 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al (U.S patent Application publication no. 2003/0014399 A1) in view of Steinkraus (US Patent 6,363,373 B1).

As per claim 6, Hansen teaches receiving a subsequent query (as user initiate new search query); using the trend information in formulating a response to the subsequent query (as query group related to the search terms and the most relevant record are displayed to a user) (parg. 0065, last 4 lines, parg. 0112).

Hansen does not explicitly teach parsing the subsequent query into one or more constituent units. However, Steinkraus teaches parsing the subsequent query into one or more constituent units (as first breaking a query search terms into word tokens) (col. 2, lines 40-41). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill on the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement the step of parsing the subsequent query into one or more constituent units as taught by Steinkraus's because it would permit concept searching database using a keyword search engine and further this implemented method should avoid any (without) modification to the keyword should a search engine have.

As per claim 7, Hansen teaches wherein the trend information is used to resolve an ambiguous term of the query (parg. 0053, parg. 0062).

As per claim 8, Hansen teaches wherein the trend information is used to suggest a related search (parg. 0054, parg. 0062).

As per claim 9, Hansen teaches wherein the trend information is used to group response data (parg 0110).

As per claim 10, Hansen teaches wherein the trend information is used to select an advertisement for display (parg. 0110).

Claims 16-20 have similar limitations as claims 6-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.


Conclusion

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642 . The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


DEBBIE LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
3/28/06